

APRIL 16, 1962

rather someone. And this someone isn't going to like the idea. If he resists – well, what can we do, except put him in jail, or, if necessary, kill him. Yet when he is shot, "democrats" in the West will cry "terrorism" or "Communist dictatorship."

Can't genuine land reform be accomplished without setting up a Communist totalitarian state – by some form of social democracy, for example?

I'm not sure what you mean by "Communist totalitarian state," but do you honestly think there can be democracy in a situation where 90 percent of the people can't read, and hardly eat enough to be able to think of anything beyond mere survival?

Then you propose to replace one kind of elite by another?

In the early stages. And yet if you look at Cuba, for example, I don't think the word elite will fit. It's not an elite when masses of people are given their land, when they are taught to read and write, when they are armed and compose their own army; and when, in short, everything is being done to put them in a position where they can take part in the running of their country as informed citizens with a decent standard of living. Would Franco do this? Would Salazar? For that matter, would the French do it in Africa, or the Americans in Latin America?

You insist that Russia does not attach strings to its aid. May we remind you of Hungary?

There are two separate things – a Russophile and a Communist. Russia does many things that I do not approve of: the firing of the superbomb comes to mind. And there was a strike among some of the peasant communities in Russia a few months ago; the authorities suppressed the strike with violence and thousands of peasants died.

If not to Russia, where then do you look for your model of Communism?

China. The Russians in 1917 destroyed a decadent bureaucracy, but now they have replaced it with still another bureaucracy. Of course, they have made amazing progress: they have accomplished in 50 years what it took the West 250 to do. And I believe Khrushchev when he says that they are moving toward real Communism. But the bureaucracy is there, and will be hard to dislodge.

In China, however, the true basis of government has been created by agrarian reform. The communes belong to those who farm them, and they work out their own problems, turning to the central government only for planning and coordination. Before the Revolution, China was a country exploited by all the major

European powers, overpopulated, divided by language differences, vast expanses of terrain and different customs, and united only by widespread famine under the rule of the imperialists and their native partners. Now in 11 years China has come a long way towards solving its economic problems. As in Cuba, schools have been built all over the country. The leaders of our Movement – like the leaders of other underdeveloped countries – have consulted with Mao Tse-tung about strategy and tactics in our fight for liberation.

When you speak of China helping other countries become independent, are you referring to Tibet?

Too little is known about that incident to condemn China. Didn't Tibet once belong to China? Don't they speak Chinese? It is possible that there was repression, as in Hungary, but what were the real sentiments of the majority of the Tibetan people? I really don't know. But I think that in 20 years the whole world will be Communist. And for the first time in human history, the problem of hunger will have been solved all over the world; there will be no more inequality of races; people will not drive Cadillacs in America while others die in mud huts in Angola.

Will there be freedom of speech or of the press?

One should not have the right to say stupid and harmful things. Take the Portuguese peasant and tell him that the Angolans are a bunch of Communist devils who want to take his land, and he will believe you – he cannot read, he knows nothing of the world. How can this man be expected to judge between two ideas, between two systems. My idealism has its limits; after we have carefully shown a man the way, we want to be very certain he does not lose it.

Who is to decide which books are harmful?

A committee of writers – perhaps with the aid of government advisers – as in Pasternak's case. What could be fairer? But your emphasis on this question reveals your twisted point of view. It is amazing to me how you can be so concerned with an idea you call "liberty" when so high a percentage of the world's people is suffering in real slavery. For the laborer in Africa or South America, there is no question of free press: the problem is to keep alive. What good is your so-called free press – which prints lies whenever business interests are at stake and which I notice your President has recently asked to censor itself – what good has it done the colored two-thirds of the world? Your assertions about "liberty" sound good; but they are based on a situation in which a minority have bought their freedom – to the extent that they have freedom – at the expense of an overwhelming majority. We are that majority.

Gerald W. Johnson THE SUPERFICIAL ASPECT

By Hook or Crook

The Hon. Richard M. Nixon seems to be one of those unfortunates whose doom it is always to be ill-served by their friends. Those well-wishers who put up the slush fund while he was in the Senate came within an ace of ending his political career in 1952; those Washington advisers, presumably friendly, who urged him into that South American adventure against the advice of the men on the ground did worse – they almost got him lynched; Allen Dulles, who is not known to have been unfriendly, unwittingly did him an ill turn when he failed to explain to Nixon that Kennedy was not informed of the Cuban invasion preparations, leading Nixon to make a serious mistake in his book; and now it appears that even his research assistant let him down by permitting Nixon to insert in the same book a passage making it apparent that Alger Hiss could have been framed.

Since Hiss has been shouting for years that he was, in fact, framed, this was much worse than merely a typographical error, since it adds another wisp of smoke to the murkiness that already clouds that incident; and the wisp is not cleared away by the chief researcher's assertion that the passage was inserted through error by one of his subordinates. What else could the man say? It's a poor hireling who will not take the rap for his employer in such a case.

It is pretty generally agreed that it was the typewriter that sunk Hiss, and it sunk him because the jury believed – and Hiss' own counsel at the time believed – that it was authentic because there was no possible way in which the prosecution could have planted a fake. Now Nixon's own book reveals that there was a way; and while the assertion that it was all a mistake by a subordinate may be perfectly true, it is the kind of truth that has too much the look of a lame excuse.

If the Hiss Case had been otherwise clear of suspicion this episode would have been shrugged off by fair-minded men. But it is not clear. On the contrary, throughout it has been clouded by the way in which it was conducted. There are many who, without any idea whether Hiss was guilty or innocent, look with strong distaste on the methods by which the man was prosecuted by Nixon, among others. By such methods, they believe, you could convict anybody of anything – you could convict George Washington of having shot Abraham Lincoln. The use of such methods, in this

view, inflicted more permanent damage on the United States than what Hiss was alleged to have done.

The basic error of the men who handled this case for the government is one into which police and prosecuting attorneys are all too likely to fall – the error of believing that there can be no greater evil than that a criminal should escape paying the penalty for his crime. But there is a greater evil and a very great American man of the law pointed it out more than 40 years ago. "I think it a less evil," said Holmes, "that some criminals should escape than that the government should play an ignoble part."

The statute of limitations was embodied in the law because it is a matter of common knowledge that it is difficult, sometimes impossible, for an innocent man to defend himself against charges based on something that happened 10 years ago. By using technicalities, the government evaded that statute in Hiss' case; and there is no doubt of what Holmes would have thought of governmental evasion of its own laws even to prevent the escape of a criminal. But since Mr. Nixon is not another Holmes, perhaps it is less than fair to hold him to the rigorous standard that the old judge set.

But it was Richard Nixon who, albeit inadvertently, brought the Hiss case back into the news. Accordingly he has only himself to blame if his conduct in that case comes again under public scrutiny and arouses again the distaste that some have always felt. To say that the blame is not his, but lies upon his misguided friends – well, if not friends, certainly associates – is to beg the question. A man always chooses his friends and usually his associates; so if they are characteristically misguided, it is a reasonable inference that the man's own judgment is none too sound.

Partly (and many people think largely) at Nixon's instigation, the government played a controversial part in the Hiss case. Hiss himself is now out of it; guilty or not, he has paid the penalty and his account is squared. But if in the process the government played an ignoble part, then in Holmes' opinion – and Holmes was a wise man – a greater evil has been inflicted upon the country by those who managed the case for the government, of whom Mr. Nixon was one of the most active, than could possibly have been inflicted on us by Hiss's escape. This is the issue revived by Nixon's book, and it is not one he can easily dodge.